

## REMARKS

### Extension of time

The present response is filed with a three-month extension of time, as denoted by the payment of a three-month extension of time fee with this response.

### Objections to the drawings

The drawings have been objected to various reasons. The source of these objections is essentially that reference numbers 406 and 408 in FIG. 4C are incorrect. Applicant has submitted a revised drawing sheet in which the reference numbers 406 and 408 in FIG. 4C have been properly replaced with reference numbers 442 and 444. Applicant therefore submits that the drawings are now in compliance, and requests the withdrawal of these objections.

### Claim rejections under 35 USC 112

Claims 3-14 and 17-20 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner has stated that the terms “weighted ingredient coefficient,” “weighted same-type coefficient,” “weighted same title-words coefficient,” “weighted shared-keywords coefficient,” and “weighted shared-ingredients coefficient” are indefinite because (1) no definition is provided of these terms; (2) how these coefficients are calculated is not provided; and, (3) how these coefficients are used to determine recipe similarity is not provided.

Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner that these terms are indefinite, in good faith and to advance the present patent application to allowance, Applicant has appropriately amended the claims to address the Examiner’s concerns. In particular, each coefficient is explicitly “defined . . . and determined . . .” as needed in the claims to address the first two concerns. Furthermore, the claims have been amended as appropriate to explicitly note that the greater a given coefficient is, the more similar the two recipes in question are.

To this extent, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of these rejections. Applicant notes that there are no pending prior art rejections as to these claims, such that Applicant submits that these claims are allowable.

Claim rejections under 35 USC 102 and under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-2 and 15-16 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Platt (6,993,532). Claims 1 and 2 have also been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Brenner (5,960,440). Claims 15 and 16 have also been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brenner in view of Platt.

Claim 1 is an independent claim, from which claims 2 and 15-16 ultimately depend. Claim 1 has been amended to substantially incorporate the subject matter of claim 3 (and appropriately amended to address the Examiner's concerns under 35 USC 112, second paragraph noted above), and claims 2 and 3 has been cancelled. Applicant submits that Brenner and Platt, either alone or in combination, do not teach a weighted ingredient coefficient as defined, determined, and used explicitly in claim 1. To this extent, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 15-16 are allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Mike Dryja, Applicant's representative, at 425-427-5094, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



December 5, 2006  
Date

Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Law Offices of Michael Dryja  
704 228<sup>th</sup> Ave NE #694  
Sammamish, WA 98074  
tel: 425-427-5094, fax: 206-374-2819